REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 6-10, 12-15, 17, 18 and 20 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 8-10, 12-14, 16, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al (US 6,636,505) in view of Eyer (US Pub. No. 2001/0049720). Claims 6, 7, 11 and 15 were rejected as being obvious to request a static IP address in view of Wang and Eyer. Claim 17 was rejected over Wang in view of Eyer and Krishan (US 6,115,755). Claim 18 is rejected over Huotari (US Pub No. 2002/0004935) in view of Eyer and Ramanathan (US 6,182,136).

Independent claims 1, 8, 12, 17 and 18 emphasize two features of the present invention. First, the authentication request is transmitted from the modem to a destination address that is set to all of the internal domain names on the list and receives authorization from each internal domain name that matches the user identifier (see p. 15, lines 28-29). Second, at least one authorization returns a static IP address reserved for the user so that for any subsequent PPPoE sessions established the user is always supplied with the same static IP address to establish connectivity to the Internet (see p. 16, lines 16-18). The invention as claimed provided a method of automatically provisioning a modem in a PPPoE network to receive authentication and basic configuration details including at least one static IP address to establish connectivity to the Internet. Once the modem has a static IP address it can communicate via the Internet to perform a variety of different functions from receiving configuration information for different services such as in Wang or access Web portals such as in Eyer.

In rejecting the previously presented claim 1, the Examiner cited to Eyer as disclosing the steps of transmitting an authentication request from the modem to listed internal domain names associated with different BSNs and receiving authorization for at least one but not all of the ISPS associated with the user identifier. In Paragraph 0031 Eyer states "A unit upon initialization may circle through a list of IP address for all service providers in a region until a service provider responds indicating the unit is authorized to access the services of the service provider." The key and important distinction is that Eyer "circles through" ... "until a" service provider responds. Therefore, at most one service provider will authorize the unit and in most

cases the request will not be made to all service providers. As claimed, the authentication request is sent to all of listed internal domain names and authorization is received for each internal domain name associated with the user.

In responding to previously presented claim 6, the Examiner acknowledges that neither Wang nor Eyer disclose a method wherein the receiving step comprises acquiring at least one static IP address. Applicant agrees and takes the position that this is because both Wang and Eyer assume that the modem has already been provisioned with basic configuration details including a static IP address. At col. 5, lines 37-41, Wang states "The ADSL modem in the CPE **110** may be automatically provisioned as follows. The subscriber orders service from the network service provider **30** by transmitting a request over the communication channel **120** from the CPE **110** to the server **130**." This presumes that the modem has an IP address from which to send the order and subsequently receive a response. Thus, the User and Service Profiles in Wang provide information such as particular domain names for different services but do not include a static IP address.

Eyer describes a method of accessing a multimedia provider's portal. In paragraph 0025 makes clear that each set top box needs an IP modem coupled to the multimedia service provider via the network and software capable of processing Web pages. The modem is already configured and capable of communicating via the Internet. The modem is either programmed by the service provider with the IP or URL address of its Web-based access portal or the method of "circling through" a list of IP addresses is used. Either way, what is provided to the modem is the IP or URL address of the portal, not a static IP address. Eyer is describing a process that occurs once the modem has been provided with its IP address and configured.

Krishan discloses a plug-in card that integrates a modem, a hub and a network interface. In Krishan, the setup software "asks the user" for information on the Internet service provider being used. "This information will typically include the telephone number used to access the ISP, whether the ISP provides a static of dynamic network address, the domain name for the ISP, and the address of a name server associated with the ISP. Optionally, pre-configured settings may be provided for large ISPs, relieving users of these large ISPs from having to provide this information." So either the user must be provided with all of this information e.g. via a telephone call with the ISP and than type it all in, which is precisely the user interaction that the present invention is designed to avoid, or the specific information must be known and

pre-configured into the modem. Either way this is a very different approach from what is claimed by Applicant. The motivations for receiving a static IP address are well understood. However, in a standard PPPoE network the convention is to supply a dynamic IP address. Krishan alone or in combination with the teachings of Wang and Eyer in no way teaches an automated method of authenticating the modem and receiving such a static IP address.

The rejections of claims 1-5, 6-10, 12-15, 17, 18 and 20 over the cited art are respectfully traversed and are believed to be patentable.

II. Conclusion

It is respectfully urged that the subject application is patentable over the cited references and is now in condition for allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below listed telephone number if, in the opinion of the Examiner, such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

No additional fees are believed necessary at this time. In the event that any additional fees are required for the prosecution of this application, please charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0383.

Respectfully submitted,

Georgann S. Grunebach
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,179

Date: May 22, 2006

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.
RE/R8/A109
2230 E. Imperial Highway
P. O. Box 956
El Segundo CA 90245

Telephone No. (310) 964-4615